

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-8, 10-34, 36-38, 40-52, 61 and 67 were previously pending in the present application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-34, 36-38, 40-52, 61 and 67 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Within the Office Action, Claims 3 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Accordingly, the Applicants amend Claims 1 and 27 to cancel the limitations cited by the Examiner, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0078230 to Hals et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hals").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because each and every element set forth in Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, and 67 is not found in Hals, either expressly nor inherently described. Specifically, Hals does not describe a system for providing travel information to an end user "wherein said travel search determination module comprises a multi-database search mechanism configured use said at least one request to simultaneously determine: travel destination information relevant to said end user; and at least one user-interest that corresponds to said at least one request; wherein said server is configured to report at least one search result to said end user via said browser-based interface, wherein said at least one search result comprises travel information content comprising both: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific, interest-dependent, and dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination."

Hals involves determining a web site navigation path for users based on one or more search terms. However, Hals does not involve returning search results comprising both interest information and destination information. The Examiner discusses Hals' description of returning a search result in reference to paragraphs [0024] and [0025].

In paragraph [0024], Hals describes a method (100) that “allows a visitor ... to a Web site using a search capability or feature of the Web site to enter one or more search terms or keywords.” Paragraph [0024] goes on to explain that the method (100) includes a step “106 during which the visitor’s navigation in the Web is directed in accordance with the navigation path determination ... [made using] ... a set of one or more search terms.” Furthermore, paragraph [0025] states that “[a]s an example of ... the method 100, a server or controller operating or implementing the method 100, and hosting a Web site having a search capability, may receive search terms "Mickey Mouse" and "Cartoon" from a visitor to the Web site.” Hals goes on to explain that “[t]he server will receive the search results during the step 102. During the step 104, the server or controller may determine that the visitor is interested in cartoon characters. As a result of such determination, the server may select to serve a special cartoon oriented search results Web page to the visitor.”

In this example, the visitor’s navigation of the Web is directed to cartoon characters, not a destination. Moreover, the visitor’s navigation is not simultaneously directed to *both* interest information *and* a destination.

On the contrary, Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, 67, and 69 require that the system return a search result that comprises travel information content comprising *both*: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific, interest-dependent, *and*

dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination for every search.

The Examiner may note that later in paragraph [0025], Hals explains that “[d]uring the step 106, the Web site may provide the special cartoon oriented search results Web page to the visitor, the Web page including a list of links pointing to one or more other Web sites that contain Mickey Mouse cartoons or information about Mickey Mouse cartoons or the Mickey Mouse cartoon character. If the server or controller receives the search terms "Florida" and "Disney" from a visitor during the step 102, the server or controller may determine that the visitor is interested in Walt Disney World in Orlando, Fla. As a result of such determination, the server may select to direct the visitor to a travel oriented search results Web site devoted to information about Walk Disney World.” While this example returns a destination, it only does so when the user enters a destination explicitly (*i.e.* “Florida”).

Therefore, Hals clearly requires a user to explicitly ask for destination information explicitly for each query in which the user expects destination information. Any interpretation to the contrary would involve a clear contravention with the teachings of Hals. For instance, referring back to the first given example above, a search consisting of “Mickey Mouse” and “Cartoon” returns nothing about a destination. On the other hand, Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, 67, and 69 require that the system return a search result that

comprises travel information content comprising *both*: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific, interest-dependent, *and* dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination for every search. Therefore, the Applicants' claimed system, receiving the same "Mickey Mouse" and "Cartoon" search terms, might result in a search result relating to a Disney history museum located near the user. Again, any interpretation to the contrary would clearly be contrary to the teachings of Hals.

For at least these reasons, Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 15-20, 22-29, 34, 36-38, 41-46, 48-52, 61, 67, and 69 are not anticipated by Hals.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Hals in view of Bollay

Also within the Office Action, Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals in view of United States Patent No. 6,457,009 to Bollay (hereinafter referred to as "Bollay").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Hals nor Bollay, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31.

Specifically neither Hals nor Bollay teach or suggest a system for providing travel information to an end user “wherein said travel search determination module comprises a multi-database search mechanism configured use said at least one request to simultaneously determine: travel destination information relevant to said end user; and at least one user-interest that corresponds to said at least one request; wherein said server is configured to report at least one search result to said end user via said browser-based interface, wherein said at least one search result comprises travel information content comprising both: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific, interest-dependent, and dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination.”

As explained above, Hals does not disclose these features. Additionally, Bollay does not disclose teach or suggest the limitations, nor does the Examiner suggest that it does.

On the contrary, Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 recite this limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 27. For at least this reason, Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 are not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Hals and Bollay.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Hals in view of Fries

Also within the Office Action, Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals in view of United States Patent No. 6,601,059 to Fries (hereinafter referred to as “Fries”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Hals nor Fries, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31.

Specifically neither Hals nor Fries teach or suggest a system for providing travel information to an end user “wherein said travel search determination module comprises a multi-database search mechanism configured use said at least one request to simultaneously determine: travel destination information relevant to said end user; and at least one user-interest that corresponds to said at least one request; wherein said server is configured to report at least one search result to said end user via said browser-based interface, wherein said at least one search result comprises travel information content comprising both: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific, interest-dependent, and dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination.”

As explained above, Hals does not disclose these features. Additionally, Fries does not disclose teach or suggest the limitations, nor does the Examiner suggest that it does.

On the contrary, Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 recite this limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 27. For at least this reason, Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 are not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Hals and Fries.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Hals in view of Wilder

Also within the Office Action, Claims 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals in view of United States Patent No. 5,408,417 to Wilder (hereinafter referred to as “Wilder”). To expedite prosecution, the Applicants currently amend Claims 1 and 27 to include limitations from Claim 13 and cancel Claim 13. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejection, because neither Hals nor Wilder, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 13.

Specifically neither Hals nor Bollay teach or suggest a system for providing travel information to an end user “wherein said travel search determination module comprises a multi-database search mechanism configured use said at least one request to simultaneously determine: travel destination information relevant to said end user; and at least one user-interest that corresponds to said at least one request; wherein said server is configured to report at least one search result to said end user via said browser-based interface, wherein said at least one search result comprises travel information content comprising both: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific,

interest-dependent, and dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination.”

As explained above, Hals does not disclose these features. Additionally, Wilder does not disclose teach or suggest the limitations, nor does the Examiner suggest that it does.

Claim 13 contains the limitation by reference to Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claim 13 is not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Hals and Wilder.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Hals

Also within the Office Action, Claims 14, 21, 40, 47, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals.

As explained above, Hals does not describe a system for providing travel information to an end user “wherein said travel search determination module comprises a multi-database search mechanism configured use said at least one request to simultaneously determine: travel destination information relevant to said end user; and at least one user-interest that corresponds to said at least one request; wherein said server is configured to report at least one search result to said end user via said browser-based interface, wherein said at least one search result comprises travel information content comprising both: logistical travel information relating to traveling to said travel destination; and location-specific,

interest-dependent, and dynamic information corresponding to local events held in the vicinity of said travel destination.” For at least this reason, Claims 14, 21, 40, and 47 are not rendered obvious by Hals.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully posits that the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record, and that all objections to and rejections of the claims have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance. Should the Examiner deem it helpful he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862